

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding. As I listened to the arguments, what arguments that are presented, from the majority Democrats, I hear some things that don't quite ring true. They talk a lot about their pay-as-you-go rules and that their g...

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

As I listened to the arguments, what arguments that are presented, from the majority Democrats, I hear some things that don't quite ring true. They talk a lot about their pay-as-you-go rules and that their great fiscal accomplishment of this Congress is that they are going to pay for spending as you go. Yet this bill increases spending by \$1.2 billion, and it is not paid for. There is no \$1.2 billion cut somewhere else. They are simply going to increase the deficit by \$1.2 billion more because they have decided they want to spend it.

They say that they are not raising taxes. But yet their budget increases spending every single year for 5 years and then miraculously says they are going to balance the budget. How do they do that? Because they did have in their budget the largest tax increase in American history.

You just heard them recently just decry the former deficits. Oh, my gosh, Republicans drove up these deficits. And, in fact, we did. And we agree that that was not the right thing to do. So what is their response? Make the deficits bigger. Take the spending that we had while we were in charge and increase it by more.

And then they have one other thing they continue to do which is to call something like this bill a ``cut." You heard the gentleman from Washington on the last proposal say that it was a devastating cut, when in fact all this does, as the gentleman from Georgia pointed out, is take what's already a 4.5 percent increase and reduce it.

Now, what I want to do is, since they're having a hard time understanding this, I want to put this up graphically so that maybe they will understand better.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here are 100 donkeys. I figured that donkeys were something that Democrats would be able to relate to. So we have 100 donkeys here. Imagine that this is 100 donkeys of spending. Here's what this bill will do. There, Mr. Chairman, are 99 donkeys; 100 donkeys here, 99 donkeys there. Probably having a hard time, I would imagine, Mr. Chairman, people in the gallery are probably having a hard time telling the difference. That's because there isn't much difference. That's because it isn't a big cut, it isn't a big reduction. If you have a million-dollar program, all we're asking is for that program to get by on \$90,000. If it's \$100 million, we're asking them to get by on a mere \$99 million. If it's a billion-dollar program, do you think that some government agencies can squeak by on \$990 million rather than a billion?

But here's the big point: It doesn't look like a lot of difference in donkeys, but if we do that, if we spend the 99 instead of 100 on every single government program, we save \$30 billion. That is real money. And this is how you save it: a little bit at a time. Ask a million-dollar program to get by on \$990,000, ask a billion-dollar program to get by on 1 percent less. And when you do that with every single program in government, you save \$30 billion a year. That, Mr. Chairman, is how we can get to a balanced budget without not only the largest tax increase in American history, without raising taxes on the hardworking people in America at all simply by asking government day by day, get by on 1 percent less. I think we can do it. I think we should vote for this amendment.